

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

|                                       |   |                       |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| <b>JOHNNY RAY GREENWOOD, #520453,</b> | ) |                       |
| <b>Plaintiff,</b>                     | ) |                       |
|                                       | ) |                       |
| <b>v.</b>                             | ) | <b>3:07-CV-0743-D</b> |
|                                       | ) | <b>ECF</b>            |
| <b>DALLAS POLICE DEPARTMENT,</b>      | ) |                       |
| <b>Defendant.</b>                     | ) |                       |

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), and an order of the District Court in implementation thereof, this cause has been referred to the United States Magistrate Judge. The findings, conclusions and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are as follows:

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

Type of Case: This is a *pro se* civil rights action brought by a State inmate.

Parties: Plaintiff is presently confined within the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division (TDCJ-CID). Defendant is the Dallas Police Department. The Court has not issued process in this case, pending preliminary screening.

Findings and Conclusions: The Court has issued three notice of deficiency and orders since the filing of this case in April of this year. On July 20, 2007, the Court issued the third deficiency order, notifying Plaintiff that his complaint was not filed on the appropriate form, that it did not comply with the requirements of Rule 8(a), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and that it was not accompanied by the requisite filing fee or a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The order directed Plaintiff to cure the deficiency within thirty days and cautioned him that failure to comply with the order would result in a recommendation that the complaint be dismissed for

failure to prosecute. As of the date of this recommendation, Plaintiff has failed to comply with the deficiency order.

Rule 41(b), of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, allows a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with the federal rules or any court order. *Larson v. Scott*, 157 F.3d 1030, 1031 (5th Cir. 1998); *McCullough v. Lynaugh*, 835 F.2d 1126, 1127(5th Cir. 1988). “This authority [under Rule 41(b)] flows from the court's inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases.” *Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co., Ltd.*, 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5th Cir. 1985) (citing *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 82 S.Ct. 1386 (1962)).

Because Plaintiff has been given ample opportunity to comply with the July 20, 2007 order, but he has refused or declined to do so, this action should be dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution. *See* Fed. R. Civ. 41(b) (an involuntary dismissal “operates as an adjudication on the merits,” unless otherwise specified); *Callip v. Harris County Child Welfare Department*, 757 F.2d 1513, 1519 (5th Cir. 1985) (setting out higher standard for dismissals with prejudice for want of prosecution).

RECOMMENDATION:

For the foregoing reasons, it is recommended that this action be DISMISSED without prejudice for want of prosecution pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

A copy of this recommendation will be mailed to Plaintiff.

Signed this 10th day of September, 2007.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Wm. F. Sanderson, Jr." The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

---

WM. F. SANDERSON, JR.  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

NOTICE

In the event that you wish to object to this recommendation, you are hereby notified that you must file your written objections within ten days after being served with a copy of this recommendation. Pursuant to *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*), a party's failure to file written objections to these proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law within such ten-day period may bar a *de novo* determination by the district judge of any finding of fact or conclusion of law and shall bar such party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected to proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law accepted by the district court.